

his argument when it is pointed out that the hyperbole did not result in anything since the Plaintiff failed to file an amended Complaint in “Parker I”.

With regard to LTSC, in his six sentences on the issue, Plaintiff has failed to come up with anything to justify reconsideration of the Court’s decision.

Based on the foregoing, the Court should deny the Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration.

The undersigned certifies that on this date, this Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration was filed electronically by counsel, Matthew S. Wolf, and by mailing a copy via United States Postal Service, first class, postage pre-paid to:

Gordon Roy Parker, *pro se* Plaintiff
4247 Locust Street, #806
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Thomas E. Geiger
817 North McCrary Road
Columbus, MS 39702-4320

These papers were served electronically upon the University of Pennsylvania through counsel, Dennis G. Young, Esquire, and upon Paul Ross through Counsel, Mary Kay Brown, Esquire. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully,

/s/ Matthew S. Wolf
Matthew S. Wolf
April 27, 2006